

REMARKS

Claims 97-104 and 106-110 are cancelled. New claims 115-129 are added. Claims 105 and 111-129 are pending in the application.

Claims 97-99, 102, 103 and 104 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by either of Cho et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,723,368, or Gnade, U.S. Patent No. 5,494,858. Without admission as to the propriety of the Examiner's rejections, independent claim 97 and claims 98-104 which depend from claim 97, are cancelled.

Claims 105-107, 112 and 113 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Rostoker et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,744,399. Without admission as to the propriety of the Examiner's rejection, claims 106-107 are cancelled.

The Examiner is reminded by direction to MPEP § 2131 that an anticipation rejection requires each and every element of a claim to be disclosed in a single prior art reference. Each of claims 105, 112 and 113 are allowable over Rostoker for at least the reason that Rostoker fails to teach each and every element of any of those claims.

With respect to independent claim 105, such recites providing a mass adjacent a conductive electrical component, the mass comprising pores and comprising molecules consisting of silicon and carbon. As discussed by the Examiner at page 5 of the present action, Rostoker discloses providing a mass 20 adjacent a conductive component 10, the mass comprising silicon in the form of silicon dioxide and fullerene. However, neither the silicon dioxide nor the fullerene molecules disclosed by Rostoker teaches the recited mass comprising molecules consisting of silicon and carbon. Accordingly, independent claim 105 is not anticipated by Rostoker and is allowable over this reference.

Dependent claims 106 and 107 are cancelled. Dependent claims 112 and 113 are allowable over Rostoker for at least the reason that they depend from allowable base claim 105.

Dependent claims 108-111 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rostoker in view of Gnade et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,494,858. The Examiner is reminded by direction to MPEP § 2143 that a proper obviousness rejection has the following three requirements: 1) there must be some suggestion or motivation to modify or combine references teachings; 2) there must be a reasonable expectation of success; and 3) the combined references must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. Without admission as to the propriety of the Examiner's rejection dependent claims 108-110 are cancelled. Dependent claim 111 is allowable over the combination of Rostoker and Gnade for at least the reason that as combined, the cited references fail to teach or suggest each and every limitation of claim 111.

As discussed above with respect to independent claim 105, Rostoker does not teach the claim 105 recited providing a mass adjacent a conductive electrical component, the mass comprising molecules consisting of silicon and carbon. Further, Rostoker does not suggest the recited mass comprising molecules consisting of silicon and carbon and independent claim 105 is therefore not rendered obvious by Rostoker. As discussed by the Examiner at page 6, section 5 of the present action, Gnade discloses forming a matrix material from TEOS utilizing spin-on techniques and converting the material to silicon dioxide. Gnade does not teach or suggest the claim 105 recited providing a mass adjacent a conductive electrical component, the mass comprising molecules consisting of silicon and carbon. As combined, Rostoker and Gnade fail to disclose or suggest the claim 105

recited providing a mass adjacent a conductive electrical component, the mass comprising molecules consisting of silicon and carbon. Accordingly, independent claim 105 is allowable over the combination of Rostoker and Gnade. Dependent claim 111 is allowable over the combination of Rostoker and Gnade for at least the reason that it depends from allowable base claim 105.

Dependent claim 114 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rostoker in view of Matthews, U.S. Patent No. 5,171,713 or alternatively in view of TeVelde, U.S. Patent No. 4,561,173. As discussed above with respect to independent claim 105, Rostoker fails to teach or suggest the recited providing a mass adjacent a conductive electrical component, the mass comprising molecules consisting of silicon and carbon. Neither of Matthews or TeVelde teach or suggest the claim 105 recited providing a mass adjacent a conductive electrical component, the mass comprising molecules consisting of silicon and carbon. As combined, neither Rostoker in view of Matthews or Rostoker in view of TeVelde teach or suggest the claim 105 recited mass adjacent a conductive electrical component, the mass comprising molecules consisting of silicon and carbon. Accordingly, independent claim 105 is not rendered obvious by the cited combinations of Rostoker in view of either Matthews or TeVelde. Dependent claim 114 is allowable over the cited combinations for at least the reason that it depends from allowable base claim 105.

New claims 115-129 do not add "new matter" to the application since each is supported by the specification as originally filed. Claims 115-129 are supported by the specification at, for example, page 15, line 6 through page 16, line 15; Figs. 10-12; and the claims as originally filed.

For the reasons discussed above, claims 105 and 111-114 are allowable and claims 115-129 are believed allowable. Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests formal allowance of pending claims 105 and 111-129 in the Examiner's next action.

The Examiner stated at page 2 of the present action that an information disclosure statement filed by applicant on August 6, 2001 failed to comply with the provisions of 37 CFR § 1.97, 1.98 and MPEP § 609 because dates were not provided with each reference. The Examiner indicated that references lacking dates on the IDS were not considered during the examination. Applicant submits herewith an additional IDS resubmitting the relevant references with proper indication that the year of publication is sufficiently earlier than the effective U.S. filing date so that the particular month of publication is not in issue or with proper indication of the month and year of publication. Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests consideration of such references during the examination of pending claims 105 and 111-129.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 8-14-2002

By: _____

Jennifer J. Taylor
Jennifer J. Taylor, Ph.D.
Reg. No. 48,711

Application Serial No.09/976,624
Filing Date October 12, 2001
Inventor..... Juengling et al.
Assignee..... Micron Technology, Inc.
Group Art Unit.....2813
Examiner Kielin, Erik J.
Attorney's Docket No.MI22-1789
Title: Methods of Forming Materials Between Conductive Electrical Components, and
Insulating Materials

VERSION WITH MARKINGS TO SHOW CHANGES MADE ACCOMPANYING
RESPONSE TO MAY 14, 2002 OFFICE ACTION

In the Claims

The claims have been amended as follows. Underlines indicate insertions and
~~strikeouts~~ indicate deletions.

Claims 97-104 and 106-110 are cancelled.

Claims 115-129 are added.

--END OF DOCUMENT--